

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Honda et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0030672) (hereinafter "Honda '672") in view of Honda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,114) (hereinafter "Honda '114").

Claims 4-6 are allowed.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application and/or to improve the form of the claim. Accordingly, claims 1-6 remain currently pending and under consideration.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Honda '672 in view of Honda'114. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application and/or to improve the form of the claim. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been newly-amended to describe a combination of features of a display device including a feature of "a total number of said subfields in each said field is unchanged." Applicants respectfully submit that the arrangement disclosed in Honda '672 must change the number of the subfields in the field. See paragraph [0149] in this regard. Applicants note that changing the total number of subfields in

the single field is the feature (apparent inventive idea) of Honda '672. On the other hand, Applicants note that the invention described in the instant application stands on the prerequisite that the total number of subfields in the field is unchanged. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the starting point of the invention disclosed in the instant application is completely different from that disclosed in Honda '672.

A second feature newly-added to the combination of features of independent claim 1 of the instant application is that "said emission takes place in each of the subfields." Applicants respectfully submit that Honda '672 includes a no-lighting subfield NE in each field. See Fig. 24 in this regard. Applicants respectfully submit that if such a no-lighting subfield NE is included, many dither noises occur as compared with the invention disclosed in the instant application which does not include any such no-lighting subfield. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the dither processing and/or error diffusion processing to be carried out in Honda '672 are inherently different from the dither processing and/or error diffusion processing to be carried out in independent claim 1 of the instant application. Applicants respectfully submit that at least one having ordinary skill in the subject art would clearly understand this to be true.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of Honda '672 is completely different from the disclosure of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application. Accordingly, even assuming, strictly arguendo, that a combination of Honda '114 and Honda '672, as asserted by the Office Action, were made, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination would still not arrive at the combination of features as specifically described in newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied Honda '672 and Honda '114 references, whether taken

separately or combined, do not teach or suggest each feature of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application. As pointed out by MPEP § 2143.03, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.’ In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” Since the prior art does not disclose or suggest any of the combinations recited in Applicants’ claims, and if anything appears to teach away from the current claim recitations, KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), Applicants submit that such recited combinations would not have been obvious in view of the applied references of record, whether taken alone or combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least because of their dependence from newly-amended independent claim 1, and the reasons discussed previously.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that the remaining claims 4-6 are allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**



By:

Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: July 27, 2009

**Customer No. 055694**

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

**1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100**

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465